

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-14 are currently pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 8 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated October 31, 2007, the Examiner objected to claim 14 for missing its claim number. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,499,026 ("Rivette") and U.S. Patent No. 7,000,187 ("Messinger").

In response, Applicants have amended claim 14 to include a claim number and amended independent claims 1 and 8. No new subject matter has been added. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, at page 24, paragraph 94. Applicants submit that amended claims 1 and 8 and their respective dependent claims overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

More specifically, amended claim 1 recites, among other things, "a first pane displaying two or more view selection links, wherein the selection links are specifically pushed to the user for completing the task required of the user and wherein each of the selection links is associated with a content pattern that defines the patterns with respect to screen structure and is selected from a common pool of user interface patterns based on the task to be completed by the specific user." As explained in Applicants' disclosure, a content pattern defines the screen structure and layout of the user interface that allows a particular user to perform a particular task. This content pattern is selected from "a common pool of user interface patterns" that have been predefined for use in activity floorplans. See Applicants' disclosure at page 24, paragraph 94. Through the selection of the content pattern, amended claim 1 enables the generation

of a user interface that “provides information to the user based on tasks and events that the user needs to accomplish or monitor” while simplifying the generation process by selecting the patterns suitable for the business activity from a common pool of user interface patterns. See Applicants’ Disclosure, at page 8, paragraph 46 and at page 24, paragraph 94.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner conceded that *Rivette* does not specifically push the selection links to the user for completing the task required of the user. Office Action, page 3. Applicants submit that *Rivette* also fails to show or suggest “wherein each of the selection links is associated with a content pattern that defines the patterns with respect to screen structure and is selected from a common pool of user interface patterns based on the task to be completed by the specific user,” as recited in amended claim 1. More specifically, *Rivette* merely shows displaying a pane containing a list of links to various patent numbers and displaying patents associated with those numbers in a generic format. Col. 114, lines 23-33. Neither the cited sections nor any other section of *Rivette* appears to describe or suggest the specific action of “displaying two or more view selection links, wherein the selection links are specifically pushed to the user for completing the task required of the user and wherein each of the selection links is associated with a content pattern that defines the patterns with respect to screen structure and is selected from a common pool of user interface patterns based on the task to be completed by the specific user,” as recited in amended claim 1.

*Messinger*, which was used by the Examiner to purportedly cure the deficiency of *Rivette*, also fails to show or suggest at least the above feature. In particular, *Messinger*, in the portion cited by the Examiner, merely refers to a single generic

graphical overlay. Each task indication is “associated with a sequence of instructions which are displayed in the graphical overlay.” Col. 2, lines 25-30. Therefore, *Messinger* only mentions changing contents within a generic graphic overlay and fails to show or suggest that “each of the selection links is associated with a content pattern that defines the patterns with respect to screen structure and is selected from a common pool of user interface patterns based on the task to be completed by the specific user,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, at least because neither *Rivette* nor *Messinger* shows or suggests the above limitation of amended claim 1, amended claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of *Rivette* and *Messinger* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Amended claim 8 includes a similar recitation as discussed above in connection with claim 1 and is, therefore, also not rendered obvious by the combination of *Rivette* and *Messinger* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least the reasons discussed. Dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14, depend from independent claims 1 and 8, respectively, and are, therefore, additionally allowable over *Rivette* and *Messinger* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) at least due to their dependency.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-14 in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants submit that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 31, 2008

By:

  
Cathy C. Ding  
Reg. No. 52,820